

troversty for a number of years. Perhaps because the pressure for an ABM defense system has increased, it has been announced that the United States will go ahead with a light ABM system. And who will the system defend against? Why, Red China, of course. Meanwhile, we have announced that we will continue to press for talks with the Soviets to avert escalation of an ABM race. The Chicago Tribune editorially observed that—

The McNamara decision to avoid the immediate soviet threat and concentrate instead on the possibility of future attack from a nonexistent Red Chinese missile force could lay the Johnson administration wide open to charges of irresponsible fiddling with national security.

I insert the Chicago Tribune editorial of September 20 entitled "Nuclear Defense—Against Whom?" in the Record at this point:

NUCLEAR DEFENSE—AGAINST WHOM?

After stalling off a decision while trying unsuccessfully to talk the Russians into a mutual ban on anti-ballistic missile [ABM] defense systems as a way of ending the nuclear arms race, the Johnson administration has finally decided to build one of its own.

It will not be designed, as one might expect, to protect the United States from attack by the only hostile missile force in existence—the Soviet Union's. Instead, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara announced Monday, it will be a relatively cheap "light" ABM system intended to foil any missile attack from Red China, which has no long range missiles now and is not expected to have any before the mid-1970s.

McNamara's decision, far from ending sharp debate over the need to build a system for protection against the growing might of the soviet missile arsenal, only fanned the flames. Many key members of Congress, including administration supporters, who had been briefed on the decision over the weekend, said they viewed this only as a first step toward building a "heavy" soviet-oriented missile defense.

Anticipating such opposition, McNamara told a group of editors in San Francisco, to whom he disclosed the ABM decision, that the administration would firmly resist every pressure to convert the 5 billion dollar "light" ABM system into one capable of coping with the more complicated soviet missile force.

The Pentagon chief downgraded the ABM system the Russians have been busily installing for several years around Moscow and other key cities as a "light" are "modest" one, easily penetrable by American missiles if they were fired in retaliation to a "first strike."

McNamara conceded the situation would change if the Kremlin decided to build a "heavy" ABM defense. Should the Russians do this—and McNamara asserted that no nation can hide such endeavors—Washington would not respond, as might be expected, by building a "heavy" counterpart.

He insisted that the response to such Soviet action would be to make America's offensive missile strike force even more sophisticated and unstoppable than it is today. Deterrence thru overwhelming nuclear might, he said, remains the cornerstone of administration strategy, rather than dependence on anti-missile defense.

Contending that both the Soviet Union and the United States have the nuclear missile power to wipe each other out in "retaliation" or "second" strikes, McNamara argued it was equally futile for either to build a costly and "heavy" ABM defense. For the United States to do so, he said, would only bring a soviet reaction to offset our advantage.

McNamara said his position was supported by four science advisers who served Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, and by directors of research for three secretaries of defense. The Pentagon boss significantly failed to mention the joint chiefs of staff.

By unanimous decision, the joint chiefs have recommended production of a "heavy" ABM system to defend against any kind of possible soviet missile attack. Given the same set of facts, General Earle G. Wheeler, JCS chairman, testified last February, the military leaders reached a different conclusion from McNamara.

Wheeler said the chiefs do not believe the soviet reaction to our building an ABM system would be as outlined by their civilian boss and his scientific advisers. Should deterrence fail and the Russians attack with their long range missiles, the chiefs believe that an ABM defense, even tho not 100 per cent perfect, would save millions of lives.

The McNamara decision to avoid the immediate soviet threat and concentrate instead on the possibility of future attack from a nonexistent Red Chinese missile force could lay the Johnson administration wide open to charges of irresponsible fiddling with national security.

TWO ORGANIZATIONS DESERVING SPECIAL TRIBUTE—RACINE SEABEE U.S. NAVAL RESERVE UNIT AND RACINE COUNTY COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS AMERICA

(Mr. SCHADEBERG (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter).

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, each year on the appropriate date, many of us rise to pay tribute to one organization or another in commemoration of the anniversary of the founding of the group. I must admit that in many cases the press of business prevents us from paying close attention to the functioning of the particular group we have praised until the next anniversary. In my case, this could never happen when it comes to my former Seabee unit in Racine, Wis., and the Racine County Council, Boy Scouts of America.

It is a pleasure to tell you here today of the close cooperation and working relationship which exists between the two groups. Only weekend before last, the Seabees under the charge of Chief Paul Buchakian, spent 2 days working at the Ka Ha Gon Boy Scout Camp near Rochester, Wis., in the second phase of a program designed to modernize and better equip the camp. In return, the Scouts gave the Seabees a "thank you" assist in the form of a cookout.

I am very proud of both organizations. I have an especially fond spot in my heart for the Boy Scouts of America. The lore and skill that the organization has passed to each young generation in turn has served it well. I know that my son, who is now preparing to serve in the Armed Forces, is better prepared to face the tasks ahead after having an excellent Scouting background.

There is every reason to believe that this Nation will retain its basic strength as long as it contains outstanding groups such as the Racine Seabee U.S. Naval Reserve Unit and the Racine County Council, Boy Scouts of America.

THE CENTER FOR INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS, INC.

(Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Center for Inter-American Relations has opened at 680 Park Avenue, in my district.

With the current world posture and the increasing interest in our relations with the other nations on this continent, this is indeed a welcome development.

The center describes its purpose as "designed to meet two critical needs: more effective communication among those concerned with the process of political, economic, and social development in the hemisphere; and greater awareness in the United States of the artistic traditions and cultural accomplishments of Latin America, the Caribbean area, and Canada."

The headquarters of the center deserves more than passing reference. It is a six-story town house designed in 1911 by the architectural firm of McKim, Mead & White. Presented to the center by the Marquesa de Cuevas, the house has been completely renovated and equipped with an art gallery, offices, seminar rooms, a library, and reception and dining facilities.

Perhaps more interesting, if not more important, is the fact that it previously was a Soviet center and Mr. Khrushchev appeared on its balcony, which makes this new use for friendship and culture all the more significant.

A group of outstanding citizens of the Nation are involved in furthering the center's work. Among them are:

Honorary trustees: The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the Honorable NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, the Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY, the Honorable JOHN V. LINDSAY, the Honorable COVEY T. OLIVER, the Honorable SOL M. LINOWITZ, the Marquesa de Cuevas.

Officers: David Rockefeller, chairman of the board; William D. Rogers, president; William H. MacLeish, executive director; Jack B. Collins, vice president, development; Francis E. Grimes, treasurer; Forrest D. Murden, Jr., secretary.

Directors: William E. Barlow, Charles W. Cole, René d'Harnoncourt, Leonard H. Goldenson, Lincoln Gordon, Andrew Heiskell, Edgar F. Kaiser, Archibald MacLeish, Thomas C. Mann, George Meany, George S. Moore, Forrest D. Murden, Jr., James A. Perkins, David Rockefeller, William D. Rogers, David S. Smith, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, Edward Larcque Tinker, Rawleigh Warner, Jr., John R. White.

The inauguration of the center on September 18 saw an impressive delegation present, with Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY giving the address.

I am pleased to bring his remarks on this occasion to the attention of my colleagues.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY AT THE CENTER FOR INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS, NEW YORK, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 18, 1967

A year ago I was honored to accept an invitation to become an Honorary Trustee of

September 20, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

clear to builders, realtors, and lenders what constitutes violation of the Order, and what the consequences will be. At present, the worst a builder who chooses to discriminate faces is the slight possibility that he will be forced to change his decision. Only if he then refuses to sell, does he face the possibility of sanctions.

The Veterans Administration compliance program is even less developed than FHA's. Either the VA should develop its own equal opportunity staff, with enforcement functions, or this responsibility should be transferred to HUD.

4. ATTITUDES

The AFSC Report was especially critical of the attitude and performance of the FHA and the VA in the processing of complaints. AFSC contends that there are delays, and that the complaint procedure of FHA and VA are "clumsy and grossly inadequate tools." The VA is reported to be most reluctant to charge discrimination except when the formal refusal to sell a house is involved. It should be obvious that refusal to show a house is tantamount to a refusal to sell and constitutes discrimination.

The FHA and VA are also alleged to favor the builder except when confronted with the most obvious discrimination. We are not in a position to determine the attitude of individual staff members. However, we concur with the recommendations that hearings be formalized; that the policy on the Executive Order be made clear to all staff members through more adequate training; and that the use of the equal opportunity staff, who presently have no "line" authority should be broadened. The caution reflected in the apparent fear of offending the industry warrants a change of attitudes.

At the meeting on August 15, HUD and FHA representatives repeatedly asserted that their authority is limited under the present Executive Order, and that they really favor a Federal fair housing law. In all candor, let us recognize that the possibility of a fair housing law passing during this session of Congress is remote. Moreover, if FHA is incapable or unwilling to enforce the Executive Order whose mandate is clear affecting twenty percent of the industry, what will be the fate of a blanket fair housing law? Conversely, if FHA believes that a fair housing law is workable, why is it not prepared to fully enforce the existing Order?

CONCLUSION

Of course, we also believe that an effectively enforced fair housing law is ultimately required. However, the existing authority should be enforced to its fullest. It only covers a fraction of new housing, but it is a very significant fraction of suburban middle income housing. Many Negro families now trapped in urban ghettos can afford this type of housing. The ghetto uprisings can be traced to two principal factors—housing and jobs. Education and job training are relatively longer term tasks, but it is inexcusable to continue to deny decent housing to Negro families who can afford it now.

Executive Order 11063 is an important wedge, for it covers a substantial part of the housing which many urban Negroes can afford now. Until additional authority is legislated, it is critical that the Order be implemented to the fullest.

I also include the editorial from the Washington Post of September 19, 1967, entitled "More Brake Than Engine":

MORE BRAKE THAN ENGINE

The Federal Housing Administration has come in lately for a couple of brickbats that seem at once deserved and well-directed. Eight members of the House concerned with the promotion of fair housing complained very publicly the other day that FHA has followed a generally passive policy toward President Kennedy's 1962 Executive Order

prohibiting racial discrimination in housing sold under Federally insured mortgages. The complaint errs, if at all, on the side of understatement. One wonders at times if FHA has ever heard of the Executive Order—or even of the Civil Rights Bill.

Sound banking policy in Federal mortgage insurance is highly commendable, to be sure. But FHA has some sound social policy to consider, too. The Nation urgently needs decent housing for its colored as well as for its white citizens; and its Federal Government must bend every effort to shatter the ghettos that cramp human development and crimp opportunity. "It is well known," the eight Congressmen said, "that FHA's principal constituency is the housing industry. FHA is reluctant to jeopardize its standing with the industry by aggressively implementing an equal opportunity policy."

This want of ardor manifests itself in other ways as well. Locally the other day an anti-poverty housing group, the Housing Development Corporation, appealed to the national FHA office for help after its plan to rehabilitate Clifton Terrace apartments for low-income families had been twice turned down by local and regional FHA offices. Insistence on perfection gets very few housing units constructed. It is time for someone in the Administration to remind FHA that it is not a commercial bank and that security is not its sole motive. The idea is to produce housing, in the slums and the suburbs, for those who need it most.

GUERRILLAS HAVE A NEW VOICE IN AMERICA

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, other items of importance have overshadowed recent developments emanating from communism's stepping stone in the Caribbean—Cuba. While much of the rest of the world is concerned with other things, business as usual calls for subverting the nations of our hemisphere through various tactics, including guerrilla warfare.

Virginia Prewett, writing in the September 19, 1967, edition of the Washington Daily News, amplifies on an arm of Tri-Continental and LASO operations which is based here in the United States—"the Tri-Continental Information Center" in New York. As she points out, this offshoot will serve as another outlet for anti-American propaganda and action and warrants close watching.

With their "close contacts with the Vietcong," predictions of a guerrilla movement in the United States and affiliations with many of the top Communists, it would appear that Castro has another foot in our door.

I submit the Prewett article for further elaboration and incorporation into the Record at this point:

NEW YORK CENTER SPREADS ANTI-U.S. PROPAGANDA: GUERRILLAS HAVE A NEW VOICE IN AMERICA

(By Virginia Prewett)

Latin American guerrillas, the Viet Cong and the Havana-based Tri-Continental Organization (OSPAAL) now have a mouthpiece in the U.S.

This is the Tri-Continental Information Center in New York, on Broadway a few doors above Fourteenth Street. Three U.S. Communist stalwarts are among 45 announced sponsors.

In operation since early spring, the Center proposes to flex its muscles in October by bringing Guyana's Communist-leaning firebrand, Cheddi Jagan, to the U.S. for a lecture tour.

TEACH-IN

On July 13, the Center held what staffers call a "very successful" teach-in on Puerto Rico at the Horace Mann auditorium of the Columbia University Teachers College.

There Juan A. Silen, president of the Castro-connected Puerto Rican Pro-Independence Movement, attacked the U.S. in fiery terms for "oppressing" Puerto Ricans.

Spokesmen for the Center, Bulletin Co-editor Joan Levenson and John Gallo, soon to become the Center's Secretary, say its purpose is to create understanding and a constituency among the American people for the world's guerrilla movements.

The Tri-Continental Organization from its Havana base has issued a policy statement relating "the fight of the Negro people of the United States" to the "world struggle against Yankee imperialism" and exhorting American Negroes to paralyze U.S. cities and "destroy the economic, political and social system of the United States."

Asked if they expect a guerrilla movement to appear in the U.S., the Tri-Continental Center spokesman, John Gallo, said: "Not for five years."

To the query whether the guerrillas would appear then, he answered:

"Come back in five years."

CONG CONTACTS

The Center's staff says it has "many contacts" with the Vietcong and indirectly with other guerrilla movements.

The chief publications obtainable at present are the Bulletin, and an English-language version of the message—published in Granma, organ of the official Cuban Communist Party—sent by Che Guevara to the Tri-Continental Organization.

The Bulletin is sent by mail to lists of names obtained from "civil rights groups, the peace movement and college groups," according to the Center staff.

The August issue of the Bulletin prints the text of the speech by Juan Silen at the July "teach-in." Among other things, Silen charges that American and Cuban exiles flock to Puerto Rico to "exploit" the people, that the recent plebiscite was "manipulated" and that the U.S. is using Puerto Ricans as cannon fodder in Vietnam.

The Center is supported by private donations, said the staff. It was started at the suggestion of members of SANA (National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy). Among the 45 listed sponsors are:

Communist Theoretician Herbert Aptheker; Party Member Carl Bolce; Franklin Alexander, past president of the Dubois Clubs; Donna Allen of "Women Strike for Peace"; Alvah Bessie and John Gervassi, leftist writers; James Aronson, former National Guardian editor; Professors Douglas Dowd of Cornell, Sidney Peck of Cleveland's Western Reserve University, and Frank Kofsky of the University of Pittsburgh; Ruby Dee, an actress; Abe Feinglass of the Meat Cutters and Butchers Union and Paul Krassner, editor of "The Realist".

ABM

NUCLEAR DEFENSE—AGAINST WHOM?

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. BUCHANAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have made a number of insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the antiballistic missile defense system which has been the subject of con-